

R E M A R K S

It is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner found allowable subject matter in Claim 9 and would allow this claim if rewritten in independent form.

The disclosure has been objected to for not including headings. However, according to MPEP Section 608.01(a), the use of headings is only preferred. Since the use of headings is not mandatory, the Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of this objection.

Claims 4, 7 and 10 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This included deleting all of the language found indefinite by the Examiner.

Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Rasmusson et al. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rasmusson et al.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the claims recite features not anticipated by Rasmusson et al. In particular, such features include "for each of the input signals an individual processing history of adaptive echo cancelling data is kept and combined with current adaptive

beamforming data", as recited in Claim 1. A similar feature is also recited in Claims 4 and 10.

In addressing this feature in the above rejections, the calibration process disclosed in Rasmusson et al. is being relied on. However, in column 3, line 20-27, Rasmusson et al. discloses:

"A target source is activated, thereby generating an acoustic signal that is received by the microphones. The trained adaptive filters are then operated to generate jammer signals. Pseudo noise signals may be supplied to the inputs of the adaptive filters for this purpose. Respective ones of the jammer signals are then combined with corresponding signals supplied from the microphones, thereby generating combination signals."

Based on the above disclosure, it is evident that the jammer signals are not "individual processing history of adaptive echo canceling data", as required by the claims. Based on the above disclosure, it is further evident that the jammer signals are also not combined with "current adaptive beamforming data", as further required by the claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the presently recited "for each of the input signals an individual processing history of adaptive echo cancelling

data is kept and combined with current adaptive beamforming data" is not anticipated by Rasmusson et al.

In view of the above-described distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that the invention of Claims 1-6, 8 and 10 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Rasmusson et al. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the above rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn so that the present application may proceed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Russell Gross, Reg. 40,007
Attorney
(914) 333-9631